

REMARKS

Claims 12-19 are unchanged from the Amendment filed January 2, 2009 and remain pending in the present application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the supplemental remarks contained herein.

Advisory Action: Continuation of 3

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that the amendments to Claims 12 and 16 change the scope of the claims and require further consideration and/or search. However, Applicant believes the above reading by the Examiner is incorrect due to the following.

In the claim amendments filed January 2, 2009, "a unit that searches LSDBs using TCAM" was added as one element of a link state database (LSDB) search unit included in claims 12 and 16. Its additional content is supported by the present description. For example, in lines 24 to 25 on page 20 of the present description, "if corresponding data is found in the LSDB, a hit occurs in the TCAM" is described. Moreover, as shown in lines 17 to 21 on page 26 of the present description, "The LSDB search unit includes TCAM" and "LSDBs are searched using TCAM" are described. It is obvious that the LSDB search unit, including the unit that searches LSDBs using TCAM, is in an interface, for example, as shown in FIG. 21 and 22. (Additional content is added in order to emphasize the difference between the present invention and Nakamichi. In essence, it is emphasized that each interface has a function searching LSDBs using TCAM by including a link state database (LSDB) search unit.)

Therefore, the addition of “a unit that searches LSDBs using TCAM” is not new matter in claims 12 and 16.

Advisory Action: Continuation of 11

Regarding Examiner’s reading of the claims in the Advisory Action, in FIG. 2 of Nakamichi, Examiner regards an input-side router 11S itself as an interface to a transmission-side communication network and a transferring router 11R for the computer terminal. In FIG. 2 of Nakamichi, since an interface device 47 in the input-side router 11S is directly connected with the computer terminal, Examiner believes that the input-side router 11S itself acts largely as an interface.

However, the “interface” used as the input-side router 11S mentioned by the Examiner should be interpreted in a broad sense based on its action or role like the interface in a configuration of an input-side router shown in FIG. 2 of Nakamichi. As such, the “interface” used as the input-side router 11S indicated by the Examiner is definitely different from the “interface devices” represented by No. 41-47 in FIG. 2 of Nakamichi.

Meanwhile, the “interface” in the present invention indicates the “interface device (s)” itself. In fact, the “interface” in the present invention corresponds to the “interface devices” which are represented by No. 41-47 in FIG.2 of Nakamichi.

Therefore, if the present invention is applied to Nakamichi, the “interface devices” represented by No. 41-47 include the LSDB search units, respectively. The constitution above is not disclosed in Nakamichi. Thus, the present invention obviously differs from Nakamichi.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

Dated: March 3, 2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec

14204349.1